



USAID | **INDONESIA**
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

More Effective Decentralized Education Management and Governance

Baseline Report
Edition 1

March 2006

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by RTI International.

More Effective Decentralized Education Management and Governance

Baseline Report

Edition 1

Contract 497-M-00-05-00029-00
March 2006

Prepared for
USAID/Indonesia

Prepared by
RTI International
3040 Cornwallis Road
Post Office Box 12194
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2194

The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION	1
	1.1. Background	1
	1.2. DBE Districts and Target Schools	1
	1.3. Monitoring Process.....	2
	1.4. Monitoring Indicators	3
	1.5. Baseline Reporting Schedule	7
2.	BASELINE RESULTS AND ANALYSIS.....	8
	Indicator 2: <i>Percent of targeted schools that have developed long-term School Development Plans that meet a threshold of key criteria</i>	9
	Indicator 4. <i>Percent of targeted schools that disseminated Annual School Budget in at least two venues</i>	10
	Indicator 9: <i>Percent of schools with multi-source funding plan included in RPS.....</i>	11
	Indicator 15: <i>Percent of school committees in targeted schools that <u>participate in School Development Plan preparation and monitor school performance and promote transparent reporting on use of funds</u></i>	12
	Indicator 16: <i>% of school committees in targeted schools that involve community stakeholders in education</i>	14
	Indicator 17: <i>Increase in understanding by school committee members in targeted schools of the importance of broad representation of community stakeholders in school committee, including gender</i>	15
	Indicator 18: <i>Percent of Dewan Pendidikan (District Education Board (DEB)) in targeted district that <u>monitor district education performance and promote transparent reporting on use of funds</u></i>	16
	Indicator 19: <i>Percent of DEB in targeted districts that that involve community stakeholders in education</i>	18
	Indicator 20: <i>Increase understanding by members of DEB in targeted district of the importance of broad representation of community stakeholders in DEB, including gender</i>	19
	Indicator 21: <i>Percent of targeted district in which DPRD actively <u>formulate education priorities, and monitor and evaluate education progress</u>.....</i>	20
	Indicator 22: <i>Percent of local government officials in targeted districts that accept the fact that CSO and local press have a role in education</i>	22
	Indicator 28: <i>Number of PPA formed at the community, district, province, and national level</i>	24
	Indicator 25: <i>Number of grants awarded to district government in collaboration with private or NGO sectors to develop and implement ICT</i>	

	<i>innovations that have sustainable business plan and capable of wider application for improved education and management</i>	25
<i>Indicator 26:</i>	<i>Number of grants awarded to district public institutions in collaboration with private sector to develop and implement education “hotspots” that have a sustainable business plan and capable of wider application</i>	26
<i>Indicator 27:</i>	<i>Number of best practices disseminated through Web site, newsletter and other information sources</i>	27
<i>Indicator 29:</i>	<i>Total value of funds leveraged from private sector through DBE1 to replicate DBE program</i>	28
3.	Summary of Baseline Data Year 2005/2006 Cohort 1 (17 of 29 Indicators)	29
Annex 1:	Results Framework.....	32

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1	Districts and Phase 1 Project Schools (SD and MI).....	2
Table 1.2	DBE1 Key Performance Indicators.....	5
Table 1.3	DBE Baseline Reporting Schedule	7
Table 2.1	Percentage of School that Meet RPS/RAPBS Criteria.....	9
Table 2.2	Venue of Disseminating School Financial Report.....	10
Table 2.3	Percentage of School with Multi-Source Funding in RPR/RAPBS	11
Table 2.4	Percentage of School Committee Active in RPS/RAPBS Preparation	12
Table 2.5	Monitoring Rate by School Committee During the Last 6 Months.....	13
Table 2.6.	Number of School Committee Members Active in Promoting Transparency.....	13
Table 2.7	Percentage of Schools Committee Involved other Education Stakeholders..	14
Table 2.8	Percentage of People Believe that the School Committee Involved Education Stakeholders.....	14
Table 2.9	Current Composition of Project School Committees	15
Table 2.10	Groups that should be Represented on the School Committee.....	15
Table 2.11	Participation of DEB in Preparing District Education Plan	16
Table 2.12	DEB Engaged in Promoting Transparency	17
Table 2.13	Percentage of DEB that Involve other Education Stakeholders	18
Table 2.14	Representation on Project DEBs.....	19
Table 2.15	Groups that should be Represented on DEB	19
Table 2.16	Participation of DPRD in Formulating Education Priorities (including District Development Plans)	20
Table 2.17	Participation of DPRD in Monitoring and Evaluating Education Progress ..	21
Table 2.18	Level of acceptance of the role of Civil Society Organization by District Officials	22
Table 2.19	Level of acceptance of the role of Press by District Official.....	23
Table 2.20	PPA Formed at the School Level: Formal and Informal.....	24

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Acronym	Bahasa Indonesia	English
APBD	<i>Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Daerah</i>	District Government Annual Budget
APBN	<i>Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Negara</i>	National Government Annual Budget
BOS	<i>Bantuan Operasional Sekolah</i>	School Operational Fund (grants)
CA		Capacity Assessment
CDP		Capacity Development Plan
CSO		Civil Society Organization
DBE		Decentralized Basic Education
DC		District Coordinator
DPK	<i>Dewan Pendidikan Kabupaten/ Kota</i>	District Education Board
DPISS		District Planning Information Support System
Dinas Pendidikan		Education Office of Local Government
DPRD	<i>Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah</i>	District Parliament
EMIS		Education Management Information System
GDP		Gross Domestic Product
MONE		Ministry of National Education
MORA		Ministry of Religious Affairs
MI	<i>Madrasah Ibtidayah</i>	Islamic Primary School
MTs	<i>Madrasah Tsanawiyah</i>	Islamic Junior Secondary School
M&E		Monitoring and Evaluation
NGO		Non Government Organization
PMP		Performance Monitoring Plan
RPPK	<i>Rencana Pengembangan Pendidikan Kabupaten/Kota</i>	District Education Development Plan
RPS	<i>Rencana Pengembangan Sekolah</i>	School Development Plan
SC		School Committee
SD	<i>Sekolah Dasar</i>	Primary School
SMP	<i>Sekolah Menengah Pertama</i>	Junior Secondary School
USAID		United States Agency for International Development

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The USAID/Indonesia Decentralized Basic Education (DBE) program is a partnership between the Government of Indonesia and the Government of the United States of America under a Strategic Objective Agreement (SOAG) between the Coordinating Ministry for People's Welfare (Menko Kesra) and USAID. The DBE program aims to improve the quality of basic education in Indonesia through three integrated components: DBE1) more effective decentralized education management and governance, DBE2) improved quality of teaching and learning, and DBE3) increased relevance of Junior Secondary and Non-formal Education to work and life skills.

The overall **management and governance (DBE1)** objective is to develop the capacity of schools and districts to improve the efficiency and the effectiveness of their basic educational services and to strengthen the position and the role in education of local stakeholders such as parents, teachers, school committees, District Education Board (Dewan Pendidikan), Local parliament (DPRD), civil society organizations and the local press.

1.2 DBE Districts and Target Schools

The USAID/Indonesia DBE program began in 2005 in 6 provinces: North Sumatra, Banten, West Java Central Java, East Java, and South Sulawesi. Aceh province and a demonstration schools cluster in Jakarta were added to the from beginning 2006. This program aims to help improve the quality of education within more than 2,400 schools and over 0.25 million of students in 100 districts (kabupaten/kota) from 2005 through 2010.

The 100 districts will enter the project in phases or cohorts of districts as follows:

- Cohort 1: 26 districts beginning in 2005
- Cohort 2: 24 districts beginning in 2006
- Cohort 3: 50 districts beginning in 2007.

Within selected districts, the DBE Teaching/Learning component (DBE1) identifies two clusters (gugus) of approximately 10 schools and madrasah /cluster or 20 schools per district. Most clusters include urban and a rural schools. Considerations in cluster/school selection are proximity of schools, urban/rural and public school and madrasah balance, interest, capacity, and commitment. District and sub-district staff were active in this selection process. As well as encouraging exchange of information, learning materials and teaching methods, the gugus is a model for replication in other kecamatan within each district. The DBE Relevance/Life Skills component (DBE3) identifies four SMP/MTs in each district, together with non-formal and out-of-school organizations.

In the first year of the project (2005-06) DBE1 provides support to only primary schools and madrasah (SD and MI) and to district education sector. DBE1 does not support junior secondary school nor out-of-school education centers in year 1 of the project but may begin to provide support at this level in future years. Therefore, the first baseline study is

undertaken only at the primary school and district levels; future editions of the baseline report may include junior secondary data if DBE1 begins to support those schools. Aceh province and 7 demonstration schools in Jakarta were added to the project in 2006 toward the end of the period covered by this edition of the baseline report. Baseline data from these schools and two Aceh districts will be included in the next edition of the baseline report (see below.)

Table 1.1 describes the number of schools per district and province that have received DBE1 support through march, 2006 which is the period covered by this current edition of the DBE1 baseline report.

Table 1.1 Districts and Phase 1 Project Schools (SD and MI)

Districts	Schools
1. Kota Sibolga	20
2. Kab. Tapanuli Utara	20
3. Kota Binjai	20
4. Kota Tebing Tinggi	20
5. Kab. Deli Serdang	20
NORTH SUMATRA	100
4. Kab. Lebak	20
5. Kota. Cilegon	15
6. Kota Tangerang	15
BANTEN	50
1. Kab. Indramayu	21
2. Kab. Karawang	20
3. Kab. Sukabumi	20
WEST JAVA	61
1. Kab. Karanganyar	18
2. Kab. Boyolali	26
3. Kab. Jepara	18
4. Kab. Kudus	24
5. Kab. Klaten	20
CENTRAL JAVA	106
1. Kota Surabaya	14 (13)
2. Kota Mojokerto	17
3. Kab. Tuban	19
4. Kab. Sidoarjo	18
5. Kab. Bangkalan	16
EAST JAVA	84
1. Kota Palopo	23
2. Kab. Soppeng	15
3. Kab. Pangkep	15
4. Kab. Jeneponto	14
5. Kab. Enrekang	21
SOUTH SULAWESI	88
Total DBE Phase 1 schools (SD/MI)	489

1.3. Monitoring Process

Monitoring is conducted at two levels: school/madrasah and district. DBE1 District Coordinators in collaboration with district education staff conduct monitoring at the school level. The main purpose of involving district education staff is to empower them

in effective monitoring, data collection and data analysis. District level monitoring is conducted by independent consultants engaged for this purpose by DBE1. Through this process DBE1 intends to help develop capacity of selected universities to monitor and evaluate district performance in education management and governance as well as to introduce the concept of independent monitor to districts as a means to improve their performance.

In each targeted school, the district coordinator and district education staff conduct interviews, Focus Group Discussions (FGD), and collection of data from various records. Sources of information include the principal, teachers, head of the school committee, school committee members, community members living near the school, school records and other information found in the community. The District Coordinator ensures that all necessary data are collected.

District data collection was carried out by part-time consultants, who had been hired for approximately three weeks to conduct interviews, Focus Group Discussions, and gathering data from district records. Consultants interviewed members of District Education Boards (DEB) (Dewan Pendidikan), members of District Parliament (DPRD), District education Office staff (Dinas Pendidikan), Department of Religious Affairs district staff (Kandepag), Civil Society Organization/s (CSO), local press, and other education stakeholders.

1.4. Monitoring Indicators

DBE1's performance in implementing the project is measured through a set of 29 outcome/impact oriented Project Performance Indicators¹. The indicators measure achievement of DBE1 Intermediate Results as described in the Results Framework of the DBE Management and Governance Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP) which was developed between May and October 2005, in close consultation with USAID. The PMP is located in the DBE1 Monitoring and Evaluation Manual which includes all the data gathering instruments in addition to the PMP. The Intermediate Results measured through the Project Performance Indicators can be found in Annex 1 of this report.

Progress in achieving project objectives and results will be evaluated by comparing periodic measures of Project Performance Indicators against a baseline. Because impact of DBE1 interventions is expected to be more rapid at the school level compared with the district level, assessments at the school level will take place every six months while assessments at the district level will take place annually.

The current edition of the DBE1 Baseline Report provides data for 17 of 29 Indicators. The Indicators are listed in Table 1.2 below. The baseline data for the remaining indicators will be presented in subsequent editions of the baseline Report (see Section 1.5 below.) The reason that baseline data is not reported for 12 Indicators is due to the fact that the programs which those indicators will measure (including criteria for measurement) are still in the process of being developed and tested by the DBE1 team.

¹ Input and output indicators are monitored separately by Project Management and recorded elsewhere. For example, training output are recorded in TraiNet and reported in DBE quarterly report.

These programs are expected to be completed by the end of 2006; baseline data for 29 indicators will be reported by the end of 2006.

Table 1.2 DBE1 Key Performance Indicators

NOTE: Shaded boxes are indicators included in this report

Strategic Objective	<i>Indicator</i>
Improved Quality of Education in Targeted Areas of Indonesia	<u>INDICATOR 1:</u> Percent of targeted districts that developed long-term District Education Development Plans that meet a threshold of key criteria

Program Objective	<i>Indicator</i>
More Effective Decentralized Education Management and Governance	<u>INDICATOR 2:</u> Percent of targeted schools that have developed long-term School Development Plans that meet a threshold of key criteria
	<u>INDICATOR 3:</u> Number of non-targeted schools that have produced School development Plans that meet a threshold of key criteria
	<u>INDICATOR 4:</u> Percent of targeted schools that disseminated Annual School Budget in at least two venues
	<u>INDICATOR 5:</u> Percent of targeted districts in which all four key institutions of governance were involved in producing the District Education Development Plan
	<u>INDICATOR 6:</u> Percent of targeted districts with improved resource and asset management

Intermediate Result	<i>Indicator</i>
Improved Capacity of Local Government to Effectively Manage Education	<u>INDICATOR 7:</u> Percent of targeted districts that have prepared and implemented CDP meeting criteria (realistic, based on performance analysis, external input, updated periodically)
	<u>INDICATOR 8:</u> Percent of targeted districts that use a DPISS as basis for planning
	<u>INDICATOR 9:</u> Percent of targeted schools with multi-source funding plan included in RPS
	<u>INDICATOR 10:</u> Percent of targeted districts with appropriate budgets and budget processes in place
	<u>INDICATOR 11:</u> Percent of GDP allocated to basic education
	<u>INDICATOR 12:</u> Percent of targeted districts that use personnel management system for planning recruitment, deployment, and development of education personnel
	<u>INDICATOR 13:</u> Percent of targeted districts that introduced a performance based incentive system for teachers

	<p><u>INDICATOR 14:</u> Percent of targeted districts that require supervision of school-based management (SBM) and instruction in addition to routine administration</p>
Strengthened Education Governance Related Institutions	<p><u>INDICATOR 15:</u> Percent of School Committees in targeted schools that participate in School Development Plan preparation, monitor school performance and promote transparent reporting on use of funds.</p>
	<p><u>INDICATOR 16:</u> Percent of school committee in targeted schools that involve community stakeholders in education</p>
	<p><u>INDICATOR 17:</u> Increase in understanding by school committee members in targeted schools of the importance of broad representation of community stakeholders in school committee, including gender</p>
	<p><u>INDICATOR 18:</u> Percent of Dewan Pendidikan (District Education Board (DEB)) in targeted districts that monitor district education performance and promote transparent reporting on use of funds</p>
	<p><u>INDICATOR 19:</u> Percent of DEB in targeted districts that involve community stakeholders in education</p>
	<p><u>INDICATOR 20:</u> Increase understanding by members of DEB in targeted districts of the importance of broad representation of community stakeholders in DEB, including gender</p>
	<p><u>INDICATOR 21:</u> Percent of targeted districts in which DPRD actively formulate education priorities, and monitor and evaluate education progress</p>
	<p><u>INDICATOR 22:</u> Percent of local government officials in targeted districts that accept the fact that CSO and local press have a role in education</p>
	<p><u>INDICATOR 23:</u> Percent of targeted districts in which CSOs and local press advocate for and monitor and evaluate education development</p>
Increased Use of Information Resources to Enhance Education Management and Governance	<p><u>INDICATOR 24:</u> Increase in the use of enhanced ICT in the project districts</p>
	<p><u>INDICATOR 25:</u> Number of grants awarded to district governments in collaboration with private or NGO sectors to develop and implement ICT innovations that have a sustainable business plan and capable of wider application for improved education and management</p>
	<p><u>INDICATOR 26:</u> Number of grants awarded to district public institutions in collaboration with private sector to develop and implement education “hotspots” that have a sustainable business plan and capable of wider application</p>
Best Practices Disseminated and Replicated	<p><u>INDICATOR 27:</u> Number of best practices disseminated through Web site, newsletter and other information sources</p>
	<p><u>INDICATOR 28:</u> Number of PPA formed at the community, district, province, and national levels</p>
	<p><u>INDICATOR 29:</u> Total value of funds leveraged from private sector through DBE1 to replicate DBE program</p>

1.5. Baseline Reporting Schedule

The DBE1 baseline report will be presented in four editions. The complete set of baseline data for the 26 Cohort 1 districts will be presented in three editions (in accordance with the timing and sequencing of developing DBE1 programs (see Section 1.4)). The second edition for Cohort 1 (June 2006) will also include baseline data from Aceh schools and districts and Jakarta schools². Baseline data for Cohort 2 will be presented together with the final baseline data for Cohort 1 in December 2006. Baseline data for 50 new districts in Cohort 3 will be presented in December 2007. See table 1.3. DBE1 anticipates using the same indicators, criteria and measures for all three cohorts.

Table 1.3 DBE Baseline Reporting Schedule

<i>EDITION</i>	<i>DATE</i>	<i>COHORT</i>	<i>INDICATORS</i>
1	March 2006	1	17 of 29
2	June 2006	1 (Include Aceh & Jakarta)	22 of 29
3	December 2006	1 and 2	29 of 29
4	December 2007	3	29 of 29

² DBE1 will only provide support at the school level in Jakarta; hence, the applicable indicators will be limited compared with other districts. The baseline results will be reported separately.

2. BASELINE RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

This section presents baseline data and analyses for 17 of 29 indicators. Data was collected in all 489 schools/madrasah and 26 districts included in Cohort 1. Section 3 presents a summary of the data.

Indicator 2: Percent of targeted schools that have developed long-term School Development Plans that meet a threshold of key criteria

Target: 489 primary schools/madrasah (SD and MI)

Result. Only few target schools have developed School Development Plan (*Rencana Pengembangan Sekolah(RPS)*), but several schools have experience in developing School Budgeting Plans (*Rencana Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Sekolah (RAPBS)*). Therefore, we assessed both RPS and RAPBS against DBE1 School Development Plan criteria.

Only 393 of 489 schools could produce either RPS or RAPBS. Less than 4% of the schools have produced plans that meet more than 50% Of DBE1 criteria.

Table 2.1 Percentage of School that Meet RPS/RAPBS Criteria

Province	Number of school	School without RPS	Numbers of RPS Criteria Met by Each School			
			1-8 criteria	9-16 criteria	17-24 criteria	25-32 criteria
Banten	50	6 (12%)	15 (30%)	21 (42%)	1 (2%)	7 (14%)
West Java	61	0	5 (8%)	56 (92%)	0	0
Central Java	106	42 (40%)	58 (55%)	6 (6%)	0	0
East Java	84	25 (30%)	47 (56%)	12 (14%)	0	0
South Sulawesi	88	2 (2%)	69 (80.2%)	8 (9.3%)	6 (7%)	3 (3.5%)
North Sumatra	100	21 (21%)	45(45%)	33 (33%)	1 (1%)	0
Total	489	96 (20%)	239(49%)	136 (28%)	8 (1.6%)	10 (2%)

Note: Percentage are rounded

RPS/RAPBS Criteria:

1. School profile annually up-dated, 2. Data on the number of students by gender, 3. The tendency of the number of students , 4. The number of school aged nearby schools who have not gone to schools, 5. School categorization, 6. Focus on kids, 7. Contain learning progress of students? 8. Drop out rate by class, and comparison with district and sub-district, 9. The number of un-prepared students in the learning process and action to be taken, 10. Teacher quality (level, major, and competence), 11 Include school committee and other education stakeholders activity, 12. The role of school committee in designing RPS/RAPBS, 13. The role of other stakeholders in RPS/RAPBS, 14 Data on the sources to fulfill the minimal condition for learning. 15. Is the program designed according to the gap between “the real condition and the “ideal condition”, 16. Expectation formulization from stakeholder, instead of school? 17. Formulize the causes and the main cause of the gap? 18. Does the school formulize the problem solving alternatives? 19. Program to solve the problem? 20. Formulation of target before program? 21. Target formulization based on the gap and its causes?, 22. Program is formularized based on the main alternative of problem solving, 23. Breakdown of the three year program into annual program, 24. Performance indicators as a basis for monitoring. 25. Any Program specifications? 26. Annual schedule for each of the program, 27. Budget for each program, 28 The source of budget of each of the program has been identified, 29. School Plan and Budget (RAPBS) has been formularized, 30. RAPBS and its format is designed in accordance with kota/kab rule? 31. Participation of community (School Committee, Principal, and teacher) in designing RPS, 32. RPS has been approved by teacher, school committee, and principal?

Indicator 4. Percent of targeted schools that disseminated Annual School Budget in at least two venues

Target: 489 primary schools/madrasah (SD and MI)

Result. The result of the baseline reveals that majority of targeted school have not transparently reported the school income and spending. The majority of schools (55%) did not disseminate any financial report, and only 29% had disseminated their financial report only in one location, usually at the school notice board and letter to the students' parents.

Table 2.2 Venue of Disseminating School Financial Report.

No	Province	Number of schools	Disseminating in ZERO locations	Disseminating in ONE location	Disseminating in TWO locations	Disseminating in THREE locations
1	Banten	50	11 (22%)	19 (38%)	14 (28%)	6 (12%)
2	West Java	61	24 (39%)	22 (36%)	2 (3%)	13 (21%)
3	Central Java	106	73 (69%)	27 (25%)	2 (2%)	4 (4%)
4	East Java	84	46 (55%)	15 (18%)	16 (19%)	7 (8%)
5	South Sulawesi	88	46 (52%)	34 (39%)	5 (6%)	3 (3%)
6	North Sumatra	100	67 (67%)	26 (26%)	7 (7%)	0
7	Total	489	267 (55%)	143 (29%)	46 (9%)	33 (7%)

Note: Percentage are rounded

Criteria: Venue to disseminate school financial report are:

1. Inside school compound, e.g. school notice board, 2. Outside school compound, e.g. village office, during pengajian, arisan, 3. Letter to the students; parent

Indicator 9: Percent of schools with multi-source funding plan included in RPS

Target: 489 primary schools/madrasah (SD and MI)

Result. DBE1 has determined that a good funding plan should contain as many as 13 possible sources of funding. The data show that less than 8% of schools had plans with more than 6 sources of funding and none with 10 or more sources.

Table 2.3 Percentage of School with Multi-Source Funding in RPS/RAPBS

No	Province	Number of Schools	Numbers of sources of funding included in RAPBS/RPS			
			1-3 sources	4-6 sources	7-9 sources	10-13 sources
1	Banten	50	23 (46%)	10 (20)	11 (22%)	0
2	West Java	61	60 (98.4%)	1(1.6)	0	0
3	Central Java	106	14 (13.2%)	27 (25.5%)	23 (21.7%)	0
4	East Java	84	40 (47.7%)	18 (21.4%)	1 (1.2%)	0
5	South Sulawesi	88	81 (92%)	5 (5.7%)	0	0
6	North Sumatra	100	75 (75%)	4 (4%)	0	0
7	Total	489	293 (60%)	65 (13.3%)	35 (7.2%)	0

Multi-source funding are 1. Dana Dekon (De-concentration Fund)), 2. DAK (Special Allocation Fund)), 3. BOS (School Operational Cost), 4. Program one and 5. Program two of Provincial budget (APBD provinsi), 6. Salary, 7. BOS (School Operational Fund), 8. Bea-siswa (scholarship), 9. School Committee, 10. Other community fund), 11. Alumnae fund; 12. last-year budget, and 13. in-kind

Indicator 15: Percent of school committees in targeted schools that participate in School Development Plan preparation and monitor school performance and promote transparent reporting on use of funds

Target: 489 primary schools/madrasah (SD and MI)

Result 1: 45% of school committee members interviewed were considered to be not actively involved in preparing school development plans and budget based on the criteria that active members would be involved in more than 3 aspects of school development plan or budget development.

Table 2.4 Percentage of School Committee Active in RPS/RAPBS Preparation³

No	Province	Number of SC members interviewed	Degree of activity		
			Not Active (involved in 0-2 activities)	Active (involved in 3-4 activities)	Very Active (involved in 5-7 activities)
1	Banten	163	58 (36%)	48 (29%)	57 (35%)
2	West Java	174	44 (25%)	86 (49%)	44 (25%)
3	Central Java	317	151 (48%)	135 (43%)	31 (10%)
4	East Java	195	66 (34%)	111 (57%)	18 (9%)
5	South Sulawesi	251	134 (53%)	104 (41%)	13 (5%)
6	North Sumatra	266	167 (63%)	96 (36%)	3 (1%)
7	Total	1366	620 (45%)	580 (42%)	166 (12%)

Note: Percentage are rounded

Degree of activity is measured by asking each of the school committee members whether or not they involved in the following activities: (1) decided who the stakeholders were; (2) interviewed them; (3) summarized all information e.g. expectation, problems related to education; (4) involved in formulating problem and priority; (5) involved in setting up program and priority; (6) inform the students' parent about RPS; (7) supported school to post the program or RAPBS at the school notice board

Result 2. In addition to involvement in RPS or RAPBS preparation, school committee are expected to take part in monitoring school performance (teaching and learning process, result of school or national exam, etc). Based on review of school records, during the last 6 months, on average school committee members monitored school

³ Some members of school committee in Banten, Central Java and South Sulawesi visited MBE schools in Batu, East Java before the baseline data was collected. Upon returning to their respective schools, they actively involved in promoting transparency of the use of school fund, especially BOS.

performance less than 4 times during the 6 month period. This ranges from a high of 10.54 visits by Central Java school committee members to a low of 0.46 visits by South Sulawesi members. We suspect that the Central Java figure is skewed perhaps because teachers who are on the committee recorded their normal classroom work as monitoring. (A follow assessment will take place.) If the Central Java data is omitted, the average among the remaining five provinces is 2.14 visits over the six month period.

Table 2.5 Monitoring Rate by School Committee During the Last 6 Months

No	Province	Number of school committee recorded	Monitoring rate per-person/6 months
1	Banten	246	4.52
2	West Java	276	4.03
3	Central Java	588	10.54
4	East Java	197	1.09
5	South Sulawesi	360	0.46
6	North Sumatra	636	0.62
7	Total	2,303	3.54

Result 3. One of the duties of the school committee is to promote transparent use of school funds. Results of the baseline indicate that 58% of school committee members interviewed state that they have been engaged in at least one activity to promote transparent reporting of school funds.

Table 2.6. Number of School Committee Members Active in Promoting Transparency

No	Province	Total members interviewed	Number of SC member involved in promoting transparency	
			Yes	No
1	Banten	163	104 (64%)	59 (36%)
2	West Java	174	41 (24%)	133 (76%)
3	Central Java	317	255 (80%)	62 (20%)
4	East Java	195	88 (45%)	107 (55%)
5	South Sulawesi	251	165 (66%)	86 (34%)
6	North Sumatra	266	140 (53%)	126 (47%)
7	Total	1366	793 (58%)	573 (42%)

Note: Percentage are rounded

Criteria of promoting transparent use of fund are: (1) Socialization of the use of the BOS fund to the students' parents; (2) Sending copies of the use of fund to the parent; (3) Asking the school to announce the use of school fund through the mosques; (4) During the graduation farewell party, the school committee asked the school to report how the school use the fund; (5) Reporting use of school fund during the meeting between school and student parents

Indicator 16: % of school committees in targeted schools that involve community stakeholders in education

Target: 489 primary schools/madrasah (SD and MI)

Result 1. Some school committees have involved other education stakeholders in several activities such as monitoring BOS, preparing RAPBS, defining school needs, establishing classroom parent volunteers (*paguyuban kelas*), and participated in discussion of the block grant. On average only 28% of the school committees involved other education stakeholders in these activities.

Table 2.7 Percentage of Schools Committee Involved other Education Stakeholders

No	Province	Number of schools	Number of SC involved stakeholders	Percentage
1	Banten	50	22	44
2	West Java	61	35	57
3	Central Java	106	15	14
4	East Java	84	27	32
5	South Sulawesi	88	14	16
6	North Sumatra	100	25	25
7	Total	489	138	28

Note: Percentage are rounded

Result 2. Table 2.8 indicates that only 23% of school committee members interviewed indicate that the committees should involve stakeholders outside the school in school activities.

Table 2.8 Percentage of People Believe that the School Committee Involved Education Stakeholders

No	Province	Total Respondents	Yes	No	Don't know
1	Banten	168	73 (43%)	63 (37%)	32 (19%)
2	West Java	367	157 (43%)	110 (30%)	100(27%)
3	Central Java	1055	227 (22%)	275(26%)	553 (52%)
4	East Java	607	105 (17%)	240 (39%)	262 (43%)
5	South Sulawesi	689	71(10%)	292 (42%)	326 (47%)
6	North Sumatra	799	216(27%)	359 (45%)	224(28%)
7	Total	3685	849(23.1%)	1339 (36%)	1486 (41%)

Note: Percentage are rounded

Indicator 17: Increase in understanding by school committee members in targeted schools of the importance of broad representation of community stakeholders in school committee, including gender

Target: 489 primary schools/madrasah (SD and MI)

Result 1. Table 2.9 presents an analysis of the composition of the school committees in schools and madrasah in Cohort 1 of the project. Some highlights are: only 59% of the committees include women; 10% have representation of minority groups, and 12% are represented by NGOs. On the positive side 87% include parents and as many as 41% have business persons represented.

Table 2.9 Current Composition of Project School Committees

No	Province	No. of schools	Women	Student parents	Minority groups	Student and alumnae	Business group	Village official	NGO	Religious leaders	School Mone and Mora staff
1	Banten	50	61%	100%	2%	8%	44%	57%	10%	67%	28 %
2	West Java	61	80%	90%	10%	11%	40%	56%	6%	80%	10%
3	Central Java	106	51%	89%	22%	31%	66%	86%	21%	80%	37%
4	East Java	84	38%	73%	2%	7%	26%	44%	1%	57%	30%
5	South Sulawesi	88	65%	93%	2%	14%	41%	50%	18%	66%	77%
6	North Sumatra	100	66%	86%	17%	15%	29%	29%	11%	48%	32%
7	Total	489	59%	87%	10%	16%	41%	53%	12%	62%	39%

Note: Percentage are rounded

Result 2. Members of school committees were asked the open ended question: “ In your opinion who should be members of the school committee?” Results show that 35% mentioned specifically there should be women representation and 7% mentioned minorities.

Table 2.10 Groups that should be Represented on the School Committee

No	Province	No. of SC interviewed	Women	Student parents	Minority groups	Student and alumnae	Business group	Village official	NGO	Religious leaders	Mone and Mora
1	Banten	174	25%	68%	4%	4%	59%	52%	15%	60%	9 %
2	West Java	163	28%	50 %	4%	5%	23%	22%	2%	26%	9%
2	Central Java	317	39%	72%	14%	32%	47%	62%	16%	68%	34%
3	East Java	195	14%	90%	6%	11%	32%	56%	3%	67%	49%
4	South Sulawesi	251	56%	87%	6 %	15%	52%	52%	19%	70%	57%
5	North Sumatra	266	32%	72%	6%	9%	46%	43%	19% .	50.%	18%
6	Total	1366	35%	74%	7%	15%	43%	50%	13%	59%	30%

Note: Percentage are rounded

Indicator 18: Percent of Dewan Pendidikan (District Education Board (DEB)) in targeted districts that monitor district education performance and promote transparent reporting on use of funds

Target: All 26 DBE kabupaten/kota

Result 1. According to the Decree no. 44/2000 District Education Boards (DEB) should be actively involved in designing district education plans. Although the intention was to measure DEB participation in formulating District Education Development Plan (*Rencana Pengembangan Pendidikan Kabupaten (RPPK)*), RPPK is a new concept; therefore, we also assessed their involvement in formulating the District Education Strategic Plan (*renstra pendidikan*) which has been taking place for several years now.

The results show only 1% of DEB members interviewed were considered to be actively involved in preparing district education development plans based on the criteria that active members would be involved in more than 3 or more aspects of formulating the district development plan.

Table 2.11 Participation of DEB in Preparing District Education Plan

No	Province	Number of DPK interviewed	Degree of activity		
			Not Active (involved in 0-2 activities)	Active (involved in 3-4 activities)	Very Active (involved in 5-6 activities)
1	Banten	9	9 (100%)		
2	West Java	9	9 (100%)		
3	Central Java	16	16 (100%)		
4	East Java	15	14 (93%)	1 (7%)	
5	South Sulawesi	15	15 (100%)		
6	North Sumatra	15	15 (100%)		
7	Total	79	78 (99%)	1 (1%)	

Degree of activity is measured by asking each member of the DEB whether or not they involved in the following activities: 1. Decided the stakeholders outside the members of DEB as resources people in designing RPPK; 2. Interviewed them to get information about the education problem; 3. Summarized all information e.g. expectation, problems related to education; 4. Formularized problem and priority; 5. Set up program and priority; 6. Helped Dinas Pendidikan to socialize RPPK

Result 2. The members of DEB should not only be active in preparing District Education Plan but also in promoting transparency at the district level on the use of district education funds. However, in all target districts, most of them have not carried out this role appropriately. When asked the open ended question “During the last six months, have you been active in promoting transparency? and if so give an example,” only 10% provided answers to the effect that they were engaged in promoting transparency at the district level. Some examples of promoting transparency are financial report on school accreditation, the total budget that district receives and how they spent it. Members of

DEB did monitor the school activity such as BOS, School renovation, and other activities project oriented but there was no indication they did this to promote transparency.

Table 2.12 DEB Engaged in Promoting Transparency

No	Province	Total members interviewed	Number of DEB (District Education Board) involved in promoting transparency	
			Yes	No
1	Banten	9	0	9 (100%)
2	West Java	9	0	9(100%)
3	Central Java	16	0	16 (100%)
4	East Java	15	2	13 (86.6%)
5	South Sulawesi	15	0	15(100%)
6	North Sumatra	15	6	9 (60%)
7	Total	79	8 (10%)	71 (90%)

Note: Percentage are rounded

Result 3. DEB are required to **monitor district** education performance such as monitoring national test scores (UAN, UAS), Net Participation Rate/Gross Participation Rate, and Dropout Rate. As a check to determine the extent DEB carry out these duties monitors were required to review DEB monitoring records. However, none of the 26 DEB had such records.

Indicator 19: Percent of DEB in targeted districts that involve community stakeholders in education

Target: All 26 DBE kabupaten/kota

Result. Only 27% of DEB actively tried to involve other stakeholders in education activities such as: BOS socialization, Work Plan of DEB, monitoring of teaching and learning process. Table 2.13 shows that DEBs that try to involve other stakeholders varies from 67% of DBE in West Java to 0 in East Java.

Table 2.13 Percentage of DEB that Involve other Education Stakeholders

No	Province	Number of Dewan Pendidikan	Number of Dewan Pendidikan involving other stakeholders	Percentage
1	Banten	3	1	33%
2	West Java	3	2	67%
3	Central Java	5	1	20%
4	East Java	5	0	0%
5	South Sulawesi	5	1	20%
6	North Sumatra	5	2	40%
7	Total	26	7	27%

Note: Percentage are rounded

Indicator 20: Increase understanding by members of DEB in targeted district of the importance of broad representation of community stakeholders in DEB, including gender

Target: All 26 DBE kabupaten/kota

Result 1. DBE membership is based on a Major/Bupati Degree on the composition of Dewan Pendidikan. Review of all 26 DEB documents indicates women constitute only 5 % of DEB members in the 26 districts; minority groups have 1% and parents only 4% representation.

Table 2.14 Representation on Project DEBs

No	Province	Number of DP members	Women	Student parents	Minority group	Mone and Mora official	Business/industry	Government official	Community/religious leaders	NGOS	Others
1	Banten	54	6%	0%	0%	8%	13%	4%	49%	0%	21%
2	West Java and	57	4%	0%	0%	18%	16%	4%	38%	5%	16%
3	Central Java	69	7%	6%	1%	4%	9%	10%	16%	14%	35%
4	East Java	45	16%	11%	0%	14%	18%	0%	18%	0%	23%
5	South Sulawesi	85	4%	5%	1%	12%	11%	7%	25%	9%	29%
6	North Sumatra	88	0%	1%	0%	16%	9%	5%	12%	13%	45%
7	Total	398	5%	4%	1%	12%	12%	5%	25%	8%	30%

Note: percentages are rounded

Result 2. Members of DEB were asked the open ended question: “ In your opinion who should be members of the DEB?” Results show that 58% mentioned specifically there should be women representation and 42% mentioned minorities. This indicates that board members tend to have a more “enlightened” opinion of board representation in comparison to the officials that formed the board in the first place.

Table 2.15 Groups that should be Represented on DEB

No	Province	No. of DPK members interviewed	Women	Students Parent	Minority group	Mone and Mora staff	Business/private groups	Government officials	Community/religious leader	NGO
1	Banten	9	22%	0%	33%	33%	33%	33%	33%	22%
2	West Java	9	56%	0%	44%	56%	56%	11%	55%	56%
3	Central Java	16	75%	63%	13%	75%	69%	56%	75%	25%
4	East Java	15	100%	100%	80%	100%	100%	87%	100%	100%
5	South Sulawesi	15	47%	53%	53%	33%	67%	60%	80%	67%
6	North Sumatra	15	33%	33%	27%	33%	33%	33%	33%	33%
7	Total	79	58%	48%	42%	57%	62%	51%	64%	62%

Note: Percentage are rounded

Indicator 21: Percent of targeted district in which DPRD actively formulate education priorities, and monitor and evaluate education progress

Target: All 26 DBE kabupaten/kota

Result 1. DPRD are not required by law to be involved in formulating education priorities or monitoring education performance in their districts. However, DBE1 believes that such involvement on the part of DPRD will promote better education governance, and so will measure DPRD activity in this area.

The results show only 5% of DPRD in project districts indicated that some of its members were involved in such activities as identifying and analyzing problems in education and formulizing priorities based on the criteria that active members would be involved in more than 3 aspects of district education management and governance.

Table 2.16 Participation of DPRD in Formulating Education Priorities (including District Development Plans)

No	Province	Numbers of DPRD interviewed	% active in formulating education priorities (in District Education Plan)		
			No Active (involved in 0-2 activities)	Active	Very active
1	Banten	9	9 (100%)	0	0
2	West Java	9	9 (100%)	0	0
3	Central Java	16	15 (94%)	0	1 (6%)
4	East Java ⁴	12	9 (75%)	1 (8%)	2 (17%)
5	South Sulawesi	15	15 (100%)	0	0
6	North Sumatra	15	15 (100%)	0	0
7	Total	76	72 (95%)	1 (1%)	3 (4%)

Note: Percentage are rounded

Degree of activity is measured by asking each member of the DPRD from Education Commission whether or not they involved in the following activities: 1. Along with other education stakeholders, identify education problem in the district; 2. Analyze problem, 3. Formulize problem with other education stakeholders, 4. Formulize program priority, 5. Along with Dinas Pendidikan actively socialize RPPK, 6. Monitor RPPK implementation

Result 2. All DPRD contain a Commission that oversees large part of the social sector including education. DBE1 believes that the Commission would improve its governance performance if it were to actively monitor program planning such as decision making processes in the District Office of Education, quality of education policy, and education planning process as well as monitor education program implementation such as capacity

⁴ For some reasons, DPRD in Sidoharjo did not want to be interviewed by DBE1 part time consultant

of education implementers, program scheduling, allocation of funds, school and community participation and education performance such as education participation rate, repetition rate, and transition rate. The monitoring rates of DPRD members interviewed are displayed in Table 2.17. While only 8% of DPRD members indicate they monitor education performance, a relatively high number of 30% state that they monitor education program implementation.

Table 2.17 Participation of DPRD in Monitoring and Evaluating Education Progress

No	Province	Total members of DPRD interviewed	% active in monitoring		
			Program Planning	Program Implementation	Education performance
1	Banten	9	0	0	0
2	West Java	9	0	0	0
3	Central Java	16	5 (31%)	11 (69%)	6 (37%)
4	East Java	12	0	1 (8%)	0
5	South Sulawesi	15	3 (20%)	7 (47%)	0
6	North Sumatra	15	0	3 (20%)	0
7	Total	76	8 (11%)	22 (30%)	6 (8%)

Note: Percentage are rounded

Monitoring and Evaluating education progress is measured by asking each member of DPRD whether or not they involved in these activities:

Monitoring education program planning: 1. Decision making process in the Diknas, 2. Quality of education policy, 3. Education planning process, 4 Education planning quality, Education quality;

Monitoring education program implementation: 1.Orgnization implementing education, 2. Program scheduling, 3.Fund allocation, 4. Human resources who implementing the program, 5. School and community participation;

Monitoring education performance: 1. Net and Gross enrollment rate, Drop-out rate, 3. Repetition rate, 4. Transition rate, 5. National exam

Indicator 22: Percent of local government officials in targeted districts that accept the fact that CSO and local press have a role in education

Target: All 26 DBE kabupaten/kota

Result 1. We define **Civil Society Organization (CSO)** as any association or organization formed voluntarily by the public. These can be small or large, officially registered or informal, representing the interests of specific groups or the public at large. Not all district however, has any CSO. The existence of CSO is sometime difficult to trace because some of them are not registered and only established when there is an donor agency that needs NGO or CSO to implement a program.

There are different perceptions among district officials about the role of CSOs in education. Some of them agreed that CSO have helped Dinas Pendidikan during program implementation and provided good inputs. Table 2.18 however shows that the majority of district officials do not favor the active involvement of CSOs in education. In their opinion, CSOs are only a bother; some officials say that CSOs only expose negative aspects of education or only interested in asking money from schools or Dinas Pendidikan. The following table presents the different views of district official of the role of CSOs in their districts.

Table 2.18 Level of acceptance of the role of Civil Society Organization by District Officials

No	Province	Total District	Strongly accepted (3 criteria)	Accepted (2 criteria)	Not accepted (0-1 criteria)
1	Banten	3	0	2 (67%)	1 (33%)
2	West Java	3	0	1(33%	2 (67%)
3	Central Java	5	0	5 (100%)	0
4	East Java	5	0	4 (80%)	1 (20%)
5	South Sulawesi	5	0	2 (40%)	3 (60%)
6	North Sumatra	5	0	1 (20%)	4 (80%)

Note: Percentage are rounded

Criteria for “Strongly accepted” = if the district could (a) verbally accept CSOs have a role, (b) acknowledge the district gains a benefit from active role of CSOs; (c) there is an agreement or MOU between district offices and CSO; “accepted” = if 2 of the criteria apply (ab,ac,or bc); “not accepted” if one or none applies.

Similar questions were asked about district officials’ view of the role of the local press in education. In contrast to their views of the role of CSOs, the majority have a favorable opinion on local press having a role in education. This was especially true in Java where

district officials gave examples of the local press disseminating several education activities that have been beneficial. However, in North Sumatra and a few districts in South Sulawesi, district officials did not fully support the role of local press in education. In their opinion, some local press often ask money did not report the real situation. This perhaps is an indication of the “maturity” of the press on and off Java.

Table 2.19 Level of acceptance of the role of Press by District Official

No	Province	Total District	Strongly accepted	Accepted	Not accepted
1	Banten	3	0	3 (100%)	0
2	West Java	3	0	3 (100%)	0
3	Central Java	5	0	5 (100%)	0
4	East Java	5	0	5 (100%)	0
5	South Sulawesi	5	0	3 (60%)	2 (40%)
6	North Sumatra	5	0	1 (20%)	4 (80%)
7	Total	26	0	20 (77%)	6 (23%)

Note: Percentage are rounded

Criteria for “Strongly accepted” = if the district could (a) verbally accept press have a role, (b) acknowledge the district gains a benefit from active role of press; (c) there is an agreement or MOU between district offices and press to report on education; “accepted” = if 2 of the criteria apply (ab,ac,or bc); “not accepted” if one or none applies.

Indicator 28. Number of PPA formed at the community, district, province, and national level⁵

Target: All 26 DBE kabupaten/kota, 6 provinces and national level

Result. Before DBE program is implemented, some schools had already formed alliances with private firms or individuals, both formal (by signing MOU) and informal (without having signed document). Table 2.20 shows that about 22% schools already have some form of formal or informal alliance with the private sector.

Table 2.20 PPA Formed at the School Level: Formal and Informal

No	Province	Total Schools	PPA formed formally	PPA was formed Informally	No PPA Formed
1	Banten	50	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	48 (96%)
2	West Java	61	9 (15%)	2 (5%)	50 (82%)
3	Central Java	106	11 (10.3%)	21 (19.8%)	74 (70%)
4	East Java	84	14 (16.7%)	14 (16.7%)	56 (67%)
5	South Sulawesi	88	2 (2.3%)	9 (10.2%)	77(87.5%)
6	North Sumatra	100	5 (5%)	14 (14%)	81(81%)
7	Total	489	42 (8.6%)	62 (12.7%)	385(78.7%)

⁵ This edition of the baseline Report only contains school level data. Data on PPAs at the district, provincial and national level as of march 2006 will be present in Edition 2 of the report (June 2006)

Indicator 25. Number of grants awarded to district government in collaboration with private or NGO sectors to develop and implement ICT innovations that have sustainable business plan and capable of wider application for improved education and management

Target: All 26 DBE kabupaten/kota

Result

None of the targeted districts have collaboration with private sector or NGO to developed and implement ICT innovation.

Indicator 26. Number of grants awarded to district public institutions in collaboration with private sector to develop and implement education “hotspots” that have a sustainable business plan and capable of wider application

Target: All 26 DBE kabupaten/kota

Result

None of the targeted districts have collaboration with private sector or NGO to develop and implement ICT hotspots.

Indicator 27. Number of best practices disseminated through Web site, newsletter and other information sources

Target: Project wide

Result

As of March 2006 no best practices have been disseminated through project web site, newsletters of other sources.

Indicator 29. Total value of funds leveraged from private sector through DBE1 to replicate DBE program

Target: Project wide

Result

As of March 2006 no private funds had yet been leveraged by DBE1.

3. Summary of Baseline Data Year 2005/2006 Cohort 1 (17 of 29 Indicators)

No	Banten	West Java	Central Java	East Java	South Sulawesi	North Sumatra
Indicator 2: Percent of targeted schools that have developed long-term School Development Plans that meet a threshold of key criteria	0-8 Criteria					
	30%	8%	55%	56%	80.2%	45%
	9-16 Criteria					
	42%	92%	6%	14%	9.3%	33%
	17-24 Criteria					
	2%	0%	0%	0%	7%	1%
Indicator 4: Percent of targeted schools that disseminated Annual School Budget in at least two venues	25-32 Criteria					
	14%	0%	0%	0%	3.5%	0%
	Zero Location					
	22%	39%	69%	55%	52%	67%
	One Location					
	38%	36%	25%	18%	39%	26%
Indicator 9: Percent of targeted schools with multi-source funding plan included in RPS	Two Locations					
	28%	3%	2%	19%	6%	7%
	Three Locations					
	12%	21%	4%	8%	3%	0%
	1-3 sources					
	46%	98.4%	13.2%	47.7%	92%	75%
Indicator 15: Percent of school committees in targeted schools that participate in School Development Plan preparation, monitor school performance and promote transparent reporting use of funds	4-6 sources					
	20%	1.6%	25.5%	21.4%	5.7%	0
	7-9 sources					
	22%	0	21.7%	1.2%	0	0
	10-13 sources					
	0	0	0	0	0	0
Indicator 16: % of school committee in targeted schools that involve community stakeholders in education	NOT Active in RAPBS Preparation					
	36%	25%	48%	34%	53%	63%
	Active in RAPBS Preparation					
	29%	49%	43%	57%	41%	36%
	Very Active in RAPBS Preparation					
	35%	25%	10%	9%	5%	1%
	Members of SC Active in promoting transparence					
64%	24%	80%	45%	66%	53%	
Indicator 17: Increase in understanding by school committee members in the targeted schools of the importance of broad representation of community stakeholders in school committee, including gender	Members of SC DO NOT Active in promoting transparence					
	36%	76%	20%	55%	34%	47%
	Women					
	61%	80%	51%	38%	65%	66%
	Minority groups					
2%	10%	22%	2%	2%	17%	
Indicator 18: Percent of Dewan Pendidikan (District Education Board (DEB)) in	NGO					
	10%	6%	21%	1%	18%	11%
	DEB members who did not active in RPPK Preparation					
100%	100%	100%	93%	100%	100%	

No	Banten	West Java	Central Java	East Java	South Sulawesi	North Sumatra
targeted districts that monitor district education performance and promote transparent reporting on use of funds	DBE members who did not active in promoting transparence					
	100%	100%	100%	86.6%	100%	60%
Indicator 19: Percent of DEB in targeted districts that involve community stakeholders in education	33%	67%	20%	0%	20%	40%
Indicator 16: Increase understanding by members of DEB in targeted district of the importance of broad representation of community stakeholders in DEB, including gender	Women					
	6%	4%	7%	16%	4%	0%
	Minority groups					
	0	0	1%	0	1%	0
Indicator 21: Percent of targeted district in which DPRD actively formulate education priorities, and monitor and evaluate education progress	Percentage of DPRD members who are not active in RPPK Preparation					
	100%	100%	94%	75%	100%	100%
	Percentage of DPRD members who are active in monitoring Program Planning					
	0	0	31%	0	20%	11%
Indicator 22: Percent of Local Government Officials in targeted district that accept the fact that CSO and Local Press have a role in education	Percentage of DPRD members who active in monitoring Program Implantation					
	0	0	69%	8%	47%	20%
	Percentage of DPRD members who active in monitoring Education performance					
	0	0	37%	0	0	0
Indicator 25: Number of grants awarded to district government in collaboration wit private or NGO sectors to develop and implement ICT innovations that have sustainable business plan and capable of wider application for improved education and management	Percentage of District Officials who STRONGLY accepted the role of CSO					
	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Percentage of District Officials who ACCEPTED the role of CSO					
	67%	33%	100%	80%	40%	20%
	Percentage of District Officials who DO NOT ACCEPT the role of CSO					
	33%	67%	0%	20%	60%	80%
	Percentage of District Officials who STRONGLY accept edthe role of Local Press					
	0	0	0	0	0	0
Indicator 26: Number of grants awarded to district public institutions in collaboration with private sector to develop and implement education “hotspots” that have a sustainable business plan and capable of wider application	Percentage of District Officials who ACCEPTED the role of Local Press					
	100%	100%	100%	100%	60%	20%
	Percentage of District Officials who DO NOT ACCEPT the role of Local Press					
0	0	0	0	40%	80%	
Indicator 25: Number of grants awarded to district government in collaboration wit private or NGO sectors to develop and implement ICT innovations that have sustainable business plan and capable of wider application for improved education and management	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0

No	Banten	West Java	Central Java	East Java	South Sulawesi	North Sumatra
Indicator 27. Number of best practices disseminated through Web site, newsletter and other information sources	0	0	0	0	0	0
Indicator 29. Total value of funds leveraged from private sector through DBE1 to replicate DBE program	0	0	0	0	0	0
Indicator 28. Number of PPA formed at the community, district, province, and national level	PPA was formed formally at the school level					
	2%	15%	10.3%	16.7%	2.3%	5%
	PPA was formed informally at the school level					
	2%	5%	19.8%	16.7%	10.2%	14%

Note: Percentage are rounded

Annex 1: Results Framework

Annex 1 DBE 1 Results Framework

